



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,880	11/20/2003	Per-Ola Anders Orvendal	MS#303477.01 (5076)	9365
38779 7590 06/05/2008 SENNIGER POWERS LLP (MSFT) ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE, 16TH FLOOR ST. LOUIS, MO 63102				
EXAMINER CHANKONG, DOHIM				
ART UNIT 2152		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 06/05/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspatents@senniger.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/717,880

Applicant(s)

ORVENDAL ET AL.

Examiner

DOHM CHANKONG

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/13/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

- 1> This action is in response to Applicant's amendment, filed 3.13.2008. Claims 1, 7, 10, 11-22, 26, 28, and 29 are amended. Claims 1-29 are presented for further examination.
- 2> This is a final rejection.

Information Disclosure Statement

- 3> The information disclosure statement (IDS) filed on 3.13.2008 has been considered.

Response to Arguments

- 4> Because the amendments to claims 10-21 and 29 overcome the §101 rejection, the §101 rejection is withdrawn. Applicant's amendments also overcome the §112 rejection for claims 4, 7, 21, and 22. As to Applicant's arguments, they have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground of rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendment. Since Applicant has amended the claims, a new ground of rejection is justified to address the new features.

Claims 1, 6, 9-11, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 26, 27, and 29 are now rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Colson. Applicant argues that Colson does not disclose "non-rendered content data" within the packet. Applicant further argues that Colson does not disclose such a feature, Colson also cannot disclose an application executing an action based on the non-rendered content data. Applicant's arguments are persuasive only because Colson does not expressly disclose non-rendered content data within the packet. But Colson implicitly discloses such a feature.

Specifically, Colson discloses including data specifying that the data is formatted in HTML or XML format [column 1 «lines 35-47»]. Colson expressly discloses that “a corresponding parser must process the encoded document before displaying it.” Colson’s parser reads on Applicant’s claimed application, and the feature of processing the encoded packet reads on Applicant’s claimed “performing an action.” The data specifying HTML or XML format is not rendered but instead informs the parser of the appropriate processing.

Therefore, the feature of “non-rendered content data” is implied by Colson’s teaching that informs the parser of the data format of the packet. That is, because Colson discloses a parser that must process the packet depending on whether the packet is formatted as HTML or XML, Colson implies that the non-rendered data is part of the encoded packet.

Interpreting Colson in this manner is consistent with Applicant’s discussion of “text/xml” content type that is included in the packet. According to Applicant’s specification, this content type helps an application properly render the data packet based on the format of its contents [pg. 6, 0021]. Colson’s teaching of choosing the appropriate parser to process the packet mirrors this disclosure.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant’s arguments that Colson does not anticipate each and every element are persuasive. However, it would have been obvious One of ordinary skill in the art to have interpreted Colson to implicitly teach the concept of including the non-rendered content data as part of the packet to inform the processing step. Because Applicant has amended the claims, a new ground of rejection is appropriate to address the new features.

Applicant also amends claims 26-29 to recite a “game console.” This is insufficient to overcome Colson’s teaching of a computer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art to have interpreted a PC as a game console as it is beyond dispute that PCs are used as gaming machines. Applicant also amends claims 26-29 to further specify that the non-rendered content data relates to the setting of an online game. This feature overcomes the Colson reference. However, the claims are rejected under a new ground of rejection discussed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5> Claims 1-4, 6, 9-16, 18, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colson et al, U.S Patent No. 6,708,217 ["Colson"].

6> As to claims 1 and 10, Colson discloses a method for processing a notification, said method comprising:

accessing a data packet representing the notification, said data packet having at least one content type attribute [Figure 4A «item 410» | column 2 «lines 41-57» where : Colson describes the well known feature that packets contain content type identifiers that describe the content types being delivered within the packet], said content type attribute having a content data attribute associated therewith storing non-rendered content data [column 2 «line 50 and 55» | column 7 «lines 45-51» where : each entry of the packet are "to be rendered" by respective

devices], wherein the user device executes an application, said application performing an action based on the non-rendered content data [column 1 «lines 35-47» : see response to arguments above];

determining at least one characteristic of a user device based on a capability of the user device to process content data [column 4 «lines 30-41 and 48-60» where : Colson determines capabilities of network devices by submitting a query or checking a database];

selecting one of the content type attributes for processing by the user device based on the determined characteristic [column 7 «line 57» to column 8 «line 14»].

7> As to claims 2 and 12, Colson does disclose defining a filtered data packet [Figure 2 «items 270f, 270c, 270d» | column 9 «lines 17-19»] but does not expressly disclose that the filtered data packet includes the content type attribute and content data attribute. However, Colson does disclose that filtered data content includes the content data and the “document content” from the original packet sent from the server [column 7 «lines 57-62» | column 9 «lines 17-19»]. Colson discloses the use of content-type attribute and content data attribute within data packets [column 2 «lines 35-57»]. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art could have reasonably inferred that Colson’s filtered data packet (that is sent to the corresponding devices) comprises the content type and content data attributes from the original data packet

8> As to claims 3 and 13, Colson discloses sending the filtered data packet to a data communication network for processing [column 7 «line 57» to column 8 «line 15» where :

Colson discloses routing the content (filtered from the original data packet) to the respective devices for rendering].

9> As to claims 4 and 14, Colson discloses effecting the delivery of the filtered data packet via a data communication network to the user device for processing [column 7 «line 57» to column 8 «line 15» where : Colson discloses routing the content (filtered from the original data packet) to the respective devices for rendering].

10> As to claim 6, Colson discloses receiving the data packet via a data communication network from a content provider [Figure 2 «items 230, 240» where : Colson's server reads on Applicant's claimed content provider].

11> As to claim 9, Colson discloses accessing the data packet having a plurality of content type attributes [Figure 3], said content type attributes each having a content data attribute associated therewith, wherein one of said content data attributes stores non-rendered content data [column 7 «lines 45-51» where : each entry of the packet are "to be rendered" by respective devices].

12> As to claims 11 and 15, they merely disclose a computer-readable media having components that execute the methods of claims 1 and 6, respectively. As such, claims 11 and 15 are rejected for at least the same reasons set forth for claims 1 and 6, respectively.

13> As to claim 16, Colson discloses a computer-readable storage medium having stored thereon a data structure representing a notification, said data structure comprising:

a plurality of content type attributes, each of said content type attributes storing a value identifying a content type [column 7 «lines 47-51»];

a content data attribute for each of the plurality of content type attributes, said content data attribute storing content data of the content type identified by the content type attribute corresponding thereto [column 2 «lines 45-58» | column 7 «lines 47-51»], wherein one of the content type attributes has a content data attribute associated therewith storing non-rendered content data [column 7 «lines 45-51» where : each entry of the packet are “to be rendered” by respective devices], and wherein a computing device selects one of the content type attributes and processes the content data stored in the content data attribute associated therewith [column 7 «line 57» to column 6 «line 14»], and wherein the computing device executes an application, said application performing an action based on the non-rendered content data [column 1 «lines 35-47» : see response to arguments above].

14> As to claim 18, Colson discloses wherein the content type comprises one or more of the following: hypertext markup language, text, graphics, extensible markup language, audio, and video [column 7 «lines 47-51»].

15> As to claim 20, Colson discloses the content type attribute comprising formatting information for the content data [column 7 «lines 41-51» : text having ASCII or HTML formatting].

16> As to claim 21, Colson discloses the computing device comprising a gaming device, and wherein the non-rendered content data includes metadata [column 7 «line 21» where : Colson's handheld mobile computer is a gaming device | column 8 «lines 53-62»].

17> Claims 5, 17, 19, and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Colson, in view of Horvitz et al, U.S Patent No. 6,980,993 [“Horvitz”].

18> As to claim 5, Colson does not disclose that the data packet comprises a device hint attribute and its related claimed functionality. However, a data packet comprising a device hint attribute storing a characteristic representative of a specific user device was well known in the art at the time of Applicant's invention. Horvitz specifically discloses a device hint attribute storing a characteristic value representative of a specific user device, said device hint attribute being associated with one of the content type attributes, and wherein selecting one of the content type attributes comprises selecting one of the content type attributes to process based on the determined characteristic of the user device and the characteristic value stored in the device hint attribute [column 33 - Table 1A-continued : “Device preferences/hints” | column 38 «lines 9-18»].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Colson to include Horvitz's teaching of device hint functionality. One would have been motivated to modify Colson so as to insure that content types are routed to appropriate devices that can properly render the content types.

19> As to claims 17 and 19, as they do not teach or further define over previously claimed limitations, they are rejected for at least the same reasons set forth for claim 5.

20> As to claim 22, Colson discloses a system for processing a notification, said system comprising:

a second memory area to store a device characteristic of one or more computing devices associated with the user [Figure 3];

an alerts service adapted to receive a data packet from a content provider and deliver the received data packet to the computing devices based on the device characteristic stored in the second memory area, wherein said received data packet includes non-rendered content for use by the user device [column 7 «line 47» to column 8 «line 14»].

Colson does not expressly disclose storing user routing preferences. However, user routing preferences in the context of a multi-content notification system was well known in the art at the time of Applicant's invention. However, Horvitz discloses a first memory that stores user routing preferences and delivering data packets based on said routing preferences [column 37 «lines 17-63»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Colson to include Horvitz's teachings of enabling a user to specify how to route packets that contain different types of content. One would have been motivated to modify Colson as Horvitz's teaching enhances the user's control over which devices should handle certain content types.

21> As to claim 23, Colson as modified by Horvitz discloses said first memory area storing an ordered list of the computing devices [Figure 3 «item 302» : the second column of the registry reads on the first memory area | column 8 «lines 15-22»].

22> As to claim 24, Colson as modified by Horvitz discloses said second memory area to store the device characteristic identifying a processing capability of the computing devices including one or more of the following: hypertext markup language, text, graphics, extensible markup language, audio, and video [Figure 3 : the first column reading on the second memory area].

23> As to claim 25, Colson as modified by Horvitz discloses the non-rendered content comprises extensible markup language data [column 1 «lines 44-47»].

24> Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Colson, in view of Warsta et al, U.S Patent No. 2004/0181550 [“Warsta”].

25> As to claim 7, Colson does not expressly disclose selecting the content data attribute having content data with the longest length that fits on a display associated with the user device. In a similar field of invention, Warsta is directed to providing a system that retrieves and delivers appropriate content to a device based on the device’s capabilities [0009].

Like Colson, Warsta discloses a packet having a content type attribute having a

content data attribute that stores content data [Figures 4 and 5]. Warsta expressly discloses selecting the content data attribute having content data with the longest length that fits on a display associated with the user device [0051, 0030, 0056, 0057 where : Warsta discloses selecting content data based on the length (the data's memory size or "maximum size") of the content data and whether the length is appropriate for the user device. Warsta does not disclose selecting content data based on "longest length" but as discussed in the §112 rejection above, this term is interpreted as referring generally to the physical characteristics of the content data. Warsta's content selection based on the physical attributes reads on this interpretation of "longest length"].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have modified Colson's system with Warsta's content selection functionality. Warsta discloses that selecting content data based on length (memory size or actual physical size) allows users to receive copies of content that is most appropriate for their particular device's capabilities [0009]. Based on Warsta, one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to improve upon Colson's content delivery.

26> As to claim 8, Colson does not expressly disclose truncating content data wherein said truncating occurs responsive to a size restriction associated with a display of the user device. However, such functionality was well known in the time of Applicant's invention as evidenced by Warsta. Warsta discloses truncating content data wherein said truncating occurs responsive to a size restriction associated with a display of the user device [0028 where : Warsta discloses reducing an image's resolution to fit on the device's display].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Colson's system with Warsta's data truncating functionality. One would have been motivated to modify Colson as Warsta's functionality enables all users to receive content data that is specifically adapted to the capabilities of their devices [see Warsta, 0030]. Such a modification improves Colson's content delivery system by enabling the appropriate content to be delivered to users.

27> Claims 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Colson, in view of Montagna et al, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0242322 ["Montagna"].

28> As to claims 26 and 29, Colson discloses a method for processing a notification to be delivered to a game console via a data communication network, said method comprising:

accessing, prior to delivery of the notification, a data packet representing the notification, said data packet having at least one content type attribute [Figure 4A «item 410» | column 2 «lines 41-57» where : Colson describes the well known feature that packets contain content type identifiers that describe the content types being delivered within the packet], said content type attribute having a content data attribute associated therewith storing non-rendered content data [column 2 «line 50 and 55» | column 7 «lines 45-51» where : each entry of the packet are "to be rendered" by respective devices];

determining at least one characteristic of a game console based on a capability of the game console to process content data [column 4 «lines 30-41 and 48-60» where : Colson determines capabilities of network devices by submitting a query or checking a database];

selecting one of the content type attributes for processing by the game console based on the determined characteristic [column 7 «line 57» to column 8 «line 14»]; and

sending the notification to the data communication network as a function of the selected content type attribute to provide content data formatted for the game console [column 7 «line 47» to column 8 «line 14» : sending the data packet based on the content type in the data packet], wherein the game console executes an application, said application performing an action based on the non-rendered content data [column 1 «lines 35-47» : see response to arguments above].

Colson does not expressly disclose that the non-rendered content relates to the set-up of an online game. However, such a feature was well known in the art at the time of Applicant's invention. For example, Montagna discloses non-rendered content relating to the setup of an online game [0029, 0053]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Colson's system to include Montagna's teachings of including online-game related non-rendered content data. One would have been motivated to modify Colson to be useful for gaming applications as taught by Montagna [0004].

29> As to claim 27, as it does not teach or further define over previously claimed limitations, it is rejected for at least the same reasons set forth for claim 6.

30> As to claim 28, Colson as modified by Montagna discloses:

defining a filtered data packet including the selected content type attribute and content data attribute associated therewith [see rejection of claim 2]; and

sending the filtered data packet to the data communication network to provide content data formatted for the game console [column 7 «line 57» to column 8 «line 14»].

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DOHM CHANKONG whose telephone number is (571)272-3942. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday [8:30 AM to 4:30 PM].

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571.272.3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2152

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. C./

Examiner, Art Unit 2152

/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151